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Cadastral Subcommittee

- Public Land Survey System (Cadastral Reference)
  - BLM Stewardship
  - State/County Stewardship
- Parcel Level Data
  - Federally Managed Parcels
  - State Managed Parcels
  - Privately Owned Parcels
  - Tribal Lands
- Inventory of Contacts and Status
- Wildland Fire Parcel Standardization Support
- Mortgage Study Update
PLSS (Cadastral Reference) Business Needs

• US Rights
  Federal rights and interests including surface and subsurface ownership are mapped primarily to the PLSS. The PLSS is also used to index and georeference Master Title Plats and other legal records. Sustaining a high quality representation of the PLSS is essential for daily business

• Rights for the Authorized Use of Public Lands
  BLM Uses the PLSS as the basis for mapping the rights and authorizations for using public lands such as oil and gas leases, timber leases, grazing allotments, mineral leases and special land use permits. In addition, PLSS is used for mapping the restrictions for using public lands (e.g., resource protection, no surface occupancy, seasonal stipulations, etc.)

• Resource Related Mapping
  The PLSS is used extensively for resource inventories and resource management plans
PLSS Standardization Status (Cadastral Reference)

Washington-Oregon and California are being done internally. South Dakota, Oklahoma and Minnesota next priorities.
Parcel Level Data – Federal Parcels

• Chaired by Doug Vandegraft
• Draft report is out for work group review

Goals
• To identify and verify the definition of federal parcels and the attributes for core publication data for federal parcels.
• Determine the current status of parcel collection and automation in the federal land management agencies.
• Estimate the level of effort and resources required to complete a first version of the publication data set for federal parcels.
Parcel Level Data – Federal Parcels

• Many of the land agencies have developed publication servers for federally managed lands that serve internal agency needs. (COE, BIA, DoD, USFS, BLM, USFWS, NPS)

• Some have developed services for publication data for the public.

• There is a need to have a standardized format in terms of attribution and presentation to assist the general public in consuming this information.

• Many agencies are further along in the completion of the parcel data collection than expected at the beginning of the project.
Parcel Level Data – State Parcels

• Work with NSGIC to develop cadastral contacts in each state.
• Use the national GIS inventory, Ramona, to compile and maintain local and state contacts for parcel level data.
• Support states by providing them with standardized PLSS data and standardized federal parcel data for their state
• Encourage States to stand up Standardized Parcel data servers (Gov-to-Gov)
• Work with NSGIC to Develop a standard for publishing state owned lands data
Inventory of State Contacts and Status

Table 1 - 2009 Findings Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic or Measure</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of non-government owned parcels in U.S.</td>
<td>150 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of parcels in a “GIS ready” format</td>
<td>123 million (82%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Counties with parcels in a “GIS ready” format</td>
<td>Approximately 1600 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Population living in areas with parcels in a “GIS ready” format</td>
<td>Approximately 93 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of U.S. land area with parcels in a “GIS Ready” format</td>
<td>Approximately 55 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A survey of states to ascertain the status of parcel data completion was completed in early 2010. The report is available in Subcommittee's publication site [http://www.nationalcad.org/showdocs.asp?docid=1158&navsrc=Project](http://www.nationalcad.org/showdocs.asp?docid=1158&navsrc=Project)
Wildland Fire Parcel Standardization
Eastern States

**Florida** – Data is provided through a state FTP site and crosswalk to the data on the FTP site has been completed

**North Carolina** – Provided all available site address points statewide as a surrogate for parcel data to support wildland fire

**Mississippi** – five coastal counties have been cross walked and standardized

**Wisconsin** – is making progress toward statewide collection of standardized data that will be available to wildland fire

**Arkansas** – Provide available parcel data on FTP site in a standardized form, no cross walk needed
Mortgage Study Update
NGAC Recommendation

• Dodd-Frank Financial Reform Bill – 2010

• New Data Requirement –
  – as the Bureau may determine to be appropriate, the parcel number that corresponds to the real property pledged or proposed to be pledged as collateral;

• Working with the Federal Reserve Board on technical and data issues facing the implementation of this requirement
Subcommittee Vision for Cadastral NSDI

The Subcommittee’s strategic vision for a national cadastre is for the states to assume the responsibility for compilation and publication of both local government parcels, corners of common control and state public land parcels for government-to-government data sharing. The reasoning behind promoting the states to serve as the Trusted Data Source for the state’s local government parcels is based on the following “facts on the ground”:

- Local government parcel data is managed by more than 4,000 local government sources.
- Federal agencies cannot realistically manage data sharing arrangements with the more than 4,000 local government sources of parcel data.
- Each state’s “cadastral infrastructure” is slightly different requiring a customized approach.
- All states have many business interests in parcel data.
- A sustainable system dictates that the maintenance of such a system is incorporated into the daily business operations of local and state governments.
Resources Needed and Efforts

• National Coordination
  • Identified and documented the need for three national level coordinators.
  • NGAC endorsed
  • Congressional Research Service Report
    *Issues Regarding a National Land Parcel Database – May 13, 2011*

• Local and State Participation
  • Include local, tribal and state representatives on all working groups and the Subcommittee.
  • Limited budgets for non-federal entities
Resources Needed and Efforts

• Support for Parcel Data Aggregation by States
  • CAP grant mechanisms for states to compile parcel data inventory is limited

• ARRA Funding for Parcel Collection
  • Worked with USGS to identify resources and ARRA request to support parcel collection
  • BLM ARRA records collection for support of renewable energy development
National Parcel Data – Business Needs

• There is no identified business need to have a single national parcel database for all parcels in the U.S. by federal agencies

• Parcels are needed “across the nation” to support various activities, but not all of the parcels at one time.

• Parcel data provided through state hosted data services would be more easily managed and more current.
National Parcel Data – Collection Restrictions

• There are well over 4,000 individual sources of parcel data across the U.S.
• OMB restrictions limit the ability of any federal agency to do a data call to this many entities – Recent HUD experience on OMB approval
• Harvesting data from state managed data services would service needs and be more efficient.
National Parcel Data – Relationships Versus Data Collection

• Federal agencies have relationships with the local entities that participate in their programs or adjoin federal lands.
• Federal agencies work with local and state agencies on a project by project basis (land exchanges, RMPs, etc).
• Establishing working partnerships is essential to the success of continued data sharing.
National Parcel Data Producer to Producer

• Working with local, tribal, state and federal agencies makes it possible to build an integrated and accurate representation of landownership

• Resolving questions of ownership and coming to consensus builds a better maintainable product.

• Establishing stewardship boundaries will be the key to long term sustainability.